REMARKS

Claim 1, 3-5, 7, and 10 remain in the application and claims 1, 5, and 10 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 10 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Reeder in view of Oshima et al.

A feature of the present invention is to charge a fee only when access to a selected one of a plurality of supplemental pay functions of a software program is requested. According to the present invention, the software program is accessed for free unless access to one of the plurality of pay functions is requested. See the paragraph bridging pages 10 and 11 of the present application.

Independent claims 1, 5, and 10 have been amended to recite this feature of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Reeder in view of Oshima et al. fails to show or suggest a software program being accessed for free unless access to one of a plurality of pay functions is requested by a user. Reeder relates to methods of charging for use of an apparatus, such as in a rental, by time and in addition for usage, for example.

Reeder is silent about a software program being accessed for free unless access to one of a plurality of pay functions is requested by a user and, because there are no features in Oshima et al., being directed to a ciphering system, that somehow could be combined with Reeder and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent

claims 1, 5, and 10, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable distinct over Reeder in view of Oshima et al.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the claims hereby raise no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because all of the features of this invention have clearly been considered by the examiner in the prosecution of this application and because the present amendments serve only to further define and emphasize the novel features of this invention.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Bedis Couls Eewans

Cooper & Dunham LLP

Jay H. Maioli Reg. No. 27,213 Pedro C. Fernandez

Reg. No. 41,741

JHM/PCF:pmc